

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

NOTICE OF DOCUMENT DISCREPANCIES**FILED**2008 JUL 9 AM 10:52
This space for Clerk Office File

TO: ☒ U. S. DISTRICT JUDGE / ☐ U. S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE Moskowitz CLERK US DISTRICT COURT
FROM: A. Victoria, Deputy Clerk RECEIVED DATE: 7/2/08
CASE NO.: 08cv749-BTM (ATB) DOCUMENT FILED BY: Stephen BY PM DEPUTY
CASE TITLE: Stephen vs Bravo
DOCUMENT ENTITLED: Motion to amend complaint

Upon the submission of the attached document(s), the following discrepancies are noted:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Local Rule	Discrepancy
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5.1	Missing time and date on motion and/or supporting documentation
<input type="checkbox"/> 5.3	Document illegible or submitted on thermal facsimile paper
<input type="checkbox"/> 5.4	Document not filed electronically. Notice of Noncompliance already issued.
<input type="checkbox"/> 7.1 or 47.1	Date noticed for hearing not in compliance with rules/Document(s) are not timely
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 7.1 or 47.1	Lacking memorandum of points and authorities in support as a separate document
<input type="checkbox"/> 7.1 or 47.1	Briefs or memoranda exceed length restrictions
<input type="checkbox"/> 7.1	Missing table of contents
<input type="checkbox"/> 15.1	Amended pleading not complete in itself
<input type="checkbox"/> 30.1	Depositions not accepted absent a court order
<input type="checkbox"/>	Supplemental documents require court order
<input type="checkbox"/>	Default Judgment in sum certain includes calculated interest
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	OTHER: <u>Moot. Amended Complaint already filed.</u> <u>[See Doc. No. 6]</u>

Date forwarded: 7/2/08**ORDER OF THE JUDGE / MAGISTRATE JUDGE****IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:**

- ☐ The document is to be filed nunc pro tunc to date received.
- ☒ The document is NOT to be filed, but instead REJECTED. and it is ORDERED that the Clerk serve a copy of this order on all parties.

Rejected document to be returned to pro se or inmate? ☐ Yes. Court Copy retained by chambers ☐

Counsel is advised that any further failure to comply with the Local Rules may lead to penalties pursuant to Local Rule 83.1

CHAMBERS OF: Judge Moskowitz

Dated: 7/8/08
cc: All Parties

By: KMB, PSLC

Page
#1-4
Original

Mr. Jimmie Stephen
C-56483
P.O. Box 8101
San Luis Obispo, CA 93409

REJECTED

Court of United States District
State of California - Southern

CASE # 08-0749-BTM
(AJB)

JIMMIE STEPHEN
Plaintiff

v

"Beau"

ET AL Defendants

1.. Motion Request Affidavit
to "Amended Complaint"
FRCP # 15.

2.. "Copy of Docket Sheet"
in this case... for motions
pertaining "28 USC 1915" Request.

Plaintiff JIMMIE STEPHEN hereby Request to
"Amended Complaint" under "FRCP # 15" in above case #
CV-08-0749-BTM (AJB) in USDC-Southern, based
upon "Transferline" to USDC-Western Jurisdiction of
3-27-07 from RT Donnan Justice of "Supplemental Complaint"
for Tortious and Defamatory, Economic "Imminent Danger Extortion".
"Drott v Condon" 769 F. Supp. 1128 (ND 1991) ..

"Haines v Kerner" 404 U.S. 519 (1964) .. Less stringent
Standard than Low trained attorneys. all motions. Complaint etc.